



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/734,863	12/12/2003	Daniel S. Poplawski	411OE052 C3B	1540

7590

05/17/2005

Karl D. Kovach
Senior Patent Attorney
STRATOS INTERNATIONAL, INC.
7444 West Wilson Avenue
Chicago, IL 60706

EXAMINER

ABRAMS, NEIL

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2839

DATE MAILED: 05/17/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/734,863

Applicant(s)

POPLAWSKI ET AL.

Examiner

Neil Abrams

Art Unit

2839

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 March 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 30-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 30-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 2839

Claim 30 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harding in view of Sakamoto (Europe 228278), Block, Kaufman, IBM, Yingst, Parmer and Matsuchita.

Harding discussed in last office action. That assembly discloses a housing 1 and a receptacle 7 that lack mating grounding positions. IBM at 5, etc and Kaufman at 86, 86 discloses use of housing with grounded portions that are to be connected to receptacle (hot) ground portions. Obvious to use such a feature in Harding for removal of static charge as the housing is inserted. Sakamoto (see part 15) is not essential but is applied to reinforce teaching of use of receptacle grounding means. Obvious to include such means in Harding to remove static as noted above.

Harding discloses optical receptacle (subassembly) use at 4. Since these are not discussed in detail, Block at 331, 332 and Yingst at 70, 71, 190, 191 also applied to clearly show use of such items. Obvious to apply these to Harding for more clearly enabling receipt of optical signals as intended.

Harding part 7 readable as a receptacle housing having an electrical connector (pins 20) and plug housing 1 includes contacts 19 associated with circuit board 21 but lacks disclosure of use of offset ground and non-ground contacts. Matsushita at 57, 10, 13, discloses use of ground and non-ground contacts with the grounds leading the others. Obvious to use these in Harding since early ground is best for protecting the system.

Also note that receptacle 7 is to be circuit (mother) board mounted, col. 3, line 3. Harding also includes a latch 16 with a release at 18, The claim 30, lines 22-46 recited

Art Unit: 2839

^{use}
order of ~~see~~ only defines a standard and typical order of steps. Obvious to first remove static and to finish with latching step.

While above is adequate for claim 30, should issues arise, as to offset grounds feature, Parmer shows system with pcb edge 54, 62, 64 used as a matching connector and Matsushita show such edge with advanced ground. Obvious to use such features in Harding since this would enable a more direct connection (omition of pins 19) and would provide early grounding to protect the system.

Claims 31-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the references as applied to claim 30 above, and further in view of Lebby.

Harding etc lacks disclosure of diodes. Lebby, shows such type diodes. Obvious to use diode since Harding as necessary for operation of the optical connectors. For claim 33, use of coating taught by IBM. Obvious to apply this to Harding housing as easy way to form the grounding portion.

Applicant's arguments filed with the amendment have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicants arguments all seem to point out that specific patents applied do not by themselves, disclose certain of the claim 30 features. For example, see page 7, lines 20-22, page 8, lines 21, 22, page 10, lines 2-10.

^{note}
This is agreed with but ~~not~~ that the references are applied under 35 USC 103. No arguments are seen to point out unobviousness of any of the specific modifications of Harding as discussed above. For example no arguments take issue with the assertion that it would have been obvious to add grounding features to Harding parts 1, 7.

Art Unit: 2839


Nor is it asserted that the features at issue are interrelated. Basically the modified Harding housing 1 could be like that disclosed except that it would include a grounding portion (coating) on its outer surface and it would include one contact 10 that would be longer than the others and would be used for ground. Using the alternative basis, Harding housing 1 could include a planar connector like that of Parmer at 54, 62, 64 but with one contact 62, 64 being for ground and being advanced of the others.

These are only obvious changes to housing 1, based on teachings clearly found in prior art.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Neil Abrams at telephone number (571)272-2089.

Abrams/ds

05/12/05


NEIL ABRAMS
EXAMINER
ART UNIT 322